RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADVERSE EVENTS PREVALENCE, PATIENT SAFETY CULTURE AND PATIENT SAFETY PERCEPTION IN A SINGLE SAMPLE OF PATIENTS: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY

Chirinos Mónica, MBA (c)[1-2]; Orrego Carola, PhD [3-4], Montoya Cesar[5], PhD, Suñol Rosa, PhD.[2-3-4]

[1]Health Sector Management Program –University of Zulia, Maracaibo-Venezuela.
[2]PhD Candidate at the Methodology of Biomedical Research and Public Health programme. Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
[3]Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
[4]Avedis Donabedian Research Institute (FAD), Barcelona, Spain.
[5]Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
[6]Research Network on Health Service Chronic Diseases REDISSEC. Barcelona, Spain.
[7]Instituto Universitario de Tecnología de Maracaibo.

Correspondence: Chirinos Mónica. Tu salud c.a. 84 Street Av 14 N° 13B-32 Belloso. Maracaibo-Zulia State. Venezuela. Phone number: +58 414 6557200 e-mail: seguridaddelpaciente.vzla@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Fostering the understanding of the relationship between the prevalence of adverse events (AEP), the patient safety culture of healthcare professionals (PSC) and patient safety perception (PSP) could be an important step to operationalizing patient safety through an integration of different perspectives.

Objective: To assess the relationship between AE Prevalence, Patient Safety Culture and Patient Safety Perception.

Method: Cross-sectional, ex post facto comparative study on a single sample of patients. The prevalence and severity of adverse events were measured through a review of medical records (using the Modular Review Form (MRF2)). Healthcare professional patient safety culture was determined using the Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture (HSOPSC) and patients' perception of safety through the Hospital Care Safety Perceptions Questionnaire (HCSPQ). Correlation tests were used to compare the three dimensions.

Population: 556 medical records and patients were studied for the prevalence and patient safety perception study, and 397 of the healthcare providers involved in the care of these patients were surveyed for the patient safety culture study, at 2 public and 2 private hospitals.

Results: An inverse association was observed between AE prevalence and its severity and Patient Safety Culture Index (rho=-0.8) and Patient Safety Perception Index (rho=-0.6). No association was identified between Patient Safety Culture and Patient Safety Perception (rho=0.0001). No statistical differences were identified by hospital type.

Conclusions: The joint analysis of AEP, PSC and PSP, in the same sample, offers an interesting and useful perspective on the associations between the variables studied; no correlation pattern was observed between the variables.

INTRODUCTION

Patient safety has been widely studied from the perspective of adverse events (AEs) and their financial impact, the quality/safety culture at institutional level and patients' perceptions of adverse events and how they are managed. Other studies in this field have adopted varied approaches in terms of their definitions of AE, purpose,(1,2) objectives and design elements,(3,4) whether based on medical records (retrospective studies and cross-sectional studies)(5–7) or on individual follow-up care (prospective studies).(8)

The literature in this field illustrates the broad research that has been carried out offering different perspectives on patient safety; consolidating the recommendation that patient safety culture (PSC) must be fostered by healthcare teams to minimize the risks inherent in clinical practice and prevent potential AEs.(9) In addition, WHO has also emphasized the importance of patients' perception of safety, in terms of learning from the unique perspective of those experiencing the complex emotions caused by a health condition.(10) Its role has been considered crucial for the sustainability of quality systems and patient safety in healthcare institutions and in society as a whole.(11) Furthermore, the Latin American Study of Adverse Events (IBEAS), published in 2008 to promote patient safety in the region, assessed AE incidence in hospitals in five Latin American countries and concluded that there was a global prevalence for patients with some kind of AE (10.5%) (95% CI 9.91 to 11.04).(7) According to the authors of the IBEAS, higher AE prevalence can be linked to the complexity of healthcare systems in developing economies, and specifically, to a lack of material or poor healthcare infrastructure.(8,12) These findings support the idea that this type of research needs to be conducted on a wider scale in order to identify determining factors and develop appropriate policies to deal with AEs.

Although studies have been conducted to analyse patient safety culture and serious AE incidence and type,(13–16) we were unable to locate either in the literature or databases. No studies have been conducted to jointly assess AEP, PSC and PSP within the same sample. Studies must therefore be carried out at hospitals in different countries to analyse these interaction using a single sample of patients and healthcare providers directly involved in the care of those patients

Another factor examined was patient safety according to type of hospital funding. Many Latin American countries, including Venezuela, the healthcare system is made up of a public sector, funded by the State, and a private sector funded by companies and directly by users.(17) Some authors argue that as a result of market competition the private sector is more efficient at responding comprehensively to patient needs, offering a way of overcoming the possible inefficiency or government corruption found in the public sector.(18) However, research indicates that there is often a significant differentiation between public and private procedures regarding efficiency and clinical responsibility;(19) we therefore aim to make a contribution to this area of study.

The objective of this study is to integrate and evaluate AE prevalence (AEP), patient safety culture (PSC) and patient safety perception (PSP) for the same population of hospitalized patients and healthcare providers to shed new light on the unified view of patients currently held.

METHODS

This is a cross-sectional, comparative and observational study, based on the simultaneous analysis of AEP, PSC and PSP in a single sample of hospitals during 2017. Four high-level hospitals were used in the study—two public and two private (20); the analysis was conducted through a systematic and structured review of medical records and questionnaires that were distributed to healthcare professionals and patients.

I.- **Determining AE prevalence and severity:** A sample of 556 patient records (139 per hospital) was selected randomly over four months,(21)1) and then reviewed in two phases: 1. Screening of AEs: conducted by applying the guide for screening adverse effects and the clinical history form(23), both of which had been adapted and validated.(1,5,12,24) 2. Detection of AEs: using the Spanish version of the MRF2 questionnaire (Modular Revised Form) for case reviews.(1,5,12,24,25)

Variables analysis: % of AEs by hospital, % of AEs by severity and % of preventable AEs. The Mann-Whitney *U* test was used on independent samples in order to ensure comparability between public and private hospitals.

II.- Determining the safety culture perceived by healthcare professionals:(26) A survey was conducted among all the healthcare professionals at the 4 hospitals involved in the care process of each patient in the AE prevalence study. These professionals were identified by examining the patients' medical records (medical specialists, nurses, nursing assistants, nursing technicians, hemotherapy specialists, nutritionists, laboratory assistants, bioanalysts, radiology technicians, social workers, graduate medical residents, administrative staff and managers). The survey was carried out using a questionnaire entitled "Analysis of patient safety culture in hospital environments", based on the questionnaire used in the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture,(27,28) and adapted to the Spanish context(29,30).

A Patient Safety Culture Index (PSCI) was created and categorized into 4 levels in order to compare patient safety culture with the other previously established variables: Favourable (104-85), Moderately Favourable (84-65), Moderately unfavourable (64-45), Unfavourable (44-25).

The Patient Safety Culture Index (PSCI) was calculated by applying factor analysis to the set of patient safety dimensions that comprises the instrument. In order to obtain a single statistical expression to define the variable, the dimensions were grouped into three factors according to their theoretical nature, as defined by the lead author of the study; these dimensions are linearly combined to form the Index.(31,32)

III.- Determining patient safety perception: Patient safety perception was calculated using a survey conducted by specifically trained data collectors (social workers) the day before the discharge of each of the 556 patients evaluated for the AE prevalence study (139 patients at each hospital, with a 100% response rate). The survey was carried out by applying the previously validated instrument entitled "Questionnaire on perceived healthcare safety in the hospital environment".(33)

Variables analysis: To obtain the correlation between the study variables, a Patient Safety Perception Index (PSPI) was created using the dimensions that make up this variable,(28) as expressed in the measuring instrument (items established).(33) In order to obtain a single statistical value and determine the Index, the items were given a weighting with a score; these scores were subsequently added up.

To compare the level of safety perception between the public and private hospitals, the Student *t*-test was used on independent samples.

IV.- Evaluation of the association of variables: Spearman's Rho was used as a statistical model to determine the strength and nature of the relationship between the PSCI and PSPI based on AE prevalence and severity, regardless of the type of hospital.

RESULTS

I. - Characterization of the variables.

The characterization of the individuals observed is shown in Table 1.

For both types of hospitals the female population is higher than the male population, as is the 26 to 45 years-old age group with primary and secondary education levels for public hospitals, and with secondary and university education level for private hospitals. Internal medicine and paediatrics are the care units that account for the largest population in the private hospitals, with the addition of general surgery in the case of the public hospitals.

Table 1

Characteristics of the population studied, by hospital type.

CHARACTERISTICS	PUBLIC HOSPITALS		PRIVATE HOSPITALS		TOTAL	
	No.		No.			
Beds	500		450		950	
Occupation Rate	60		75		*	
Gender	N°	%	N°	%	N°	%
Female	41	82	32	76,2	73	79,3
Male	9	18	10	23,8	19	20,7
Total	50	100	42	100	92	100
Age (years)	N°	%	N°	%	N°	%
less than 15 years	1	2	0	0	1	1,2
16-25 years	10	20.4	4	9.5	14	15.2
26-45 years	20	40.8	19	45.2	39	42.4
46-65 years	13	26.5	15	35.7	28	30.4

> 66 years or more	6	10.2	4	9.5	9	9.9
Total	**50**	**100**	**42**	**100**	**92**	**100**
Attended by speciality	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**
Medicine (Non-surgical)	11	20.3	8	20.5	19	20.6
Paediatrics	13	24.0	1	5.1	14	15.2
Surgery	12	22.2	8	20.5	20	21.7
Traumatology	3	5.5	2	5.1	5	5.4
Nephrology	3	7.4	4	10.2	8	8.6
Other units	11	18.5	16	41.0	26	28.2
Total	**53**	**58.6**	**39**	**42.3**	**92**	**100**
Education level	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**
Illiterate	6	12	0	0	6	6,5
Primary	17	34	8	19	25	27,1
Secondary	19	38	18	42,9	37	40,2
Technical University	3	6	5	11,9	8	8,6
High University	5	10	11	26,2	16	17,3
Total	**50**	**100**	**42**	**100**	**92**	**100**
Healthcare providers (Staff position)	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**
Registered Nurse	*29*	7.71	49	13.03	78	20.74
Physician Assistant/Nurse Practitioner	8	2.13	6	1.60	14	3.72
Assistant Nurse	31	5.59	31	8.24	52	13.83
Staff Physician	41	10.90	24	6.38	65	17.29
Resident Physician	43	11.44	16	1.60	49	13.03
Pharmacist	2	0.27	2	0.53	3	0.80
Pharmaceutical Assistant	4	1.06	2	0.53	6	1.60
Dietician	5	1.33	2	0.53	7	1.86
Unit Assistant	7	1.86	2	0.53	9	2.39
Technician (e.g., EKG, Lab., Radiology)	15	3.99	14	3.72	29	7.71
Administration/Management	3	0.80	9	2.39	12	3.19
Other	29	7.71	23	6.12	52	13.83
Total	**217**	**54.79**	**180**	**45.21**	**397**	**100**
Professional experience	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**
less than 5 years	57	23.17	38	25.17	95	23.93
6-10 years	73	29.67	34	22.52	107	26.95
11-15 years	45	18.29	40	26.49	85	21.41
16-20 years	19	7.72	13	8.61	32	8.06
more than 20 years	52	21.14	26	17.22	78	19.65
Total	**246**	**100**	**151**	**100**	**397**	**100**
Experience in this hospital	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**
less than 5 years	91	36.99	63	41.72	154	38.79
6-10 years	54	21.95	27	17.88	81	20.40
11-15 years	40	16.26	29	19.21	69	17.38
16-20 years	15	6.10	15	9.93	30	7.56
more than 20 years	46	18.70	17	11.26	63	15.87
Total	**246**	**100**	**151**	**100**	**397**	**100**
Experience in this care unit	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**	**N°**	**%**
Less than 5 years	113	45.93	64	42.38	177	44.58
6-10 years	72	29.27	45	29.80	117	29.47
11-15 years	18	7.32	14	9.27	32	8.06
16-20 years	12	4.88	11	7.28	23	5.79
more than 20 years	31	12.60	17	11.26	48	12.09
Total	**246**	**100**	**151**	**100**	**397**	**100**

*No value applies.

II.- Comparison of AE prevalence, AE severity, Patient Safety Culture and Patient Safety Perception between the public and private hospitals

The prevalence and severity of adverse events in both types of hospital did not show any significant statistical differences (Sig = 0.100 and a value of Umw = 0.66); the prevalence of moderate-severity AE is equally present in both types of institutions, regardless of the type of hospital management (See Table 2).

The safety culture survey conducted among the healthcare professionals obtained a response rate of 67.5% (397 of the healthcare professionals responded). The Patient Safety Culture Index (PSCI) was calculated by applying factor analysis to the set of patient safety dimensions that comprise the instrument, obtaining a Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) value above 0.75 and a high level of significance in Bartlett's test of sphericity.

Table 2 shows the hypothesis test for the differences between public and private hospitals in relation to the study variables: AE Prevalence, Safety Culture Index, Safety Perception Index and AE Severity.

According to Table 2, the PSCI was determined as unfavourable for both types of institution (PuH = 52.67 and PrH = 52.96) without any significant statistical differences (t = 0.12 sig = 0.91), since the culture perceived and expressed by healthcare professionals is not linked to a particular type of hospital. The PSPI, however, displays a different behaviour according to the type of hospital (t = 8.7 sig = 0.000 PuH = 30.3 and PrH = 32.7), showing a moderately high perception in public hospitals, and high in private hospitals.

Table 2

Hypothesis testing for the comparison of the three variables studied, by hospital.

VARIABLE	PUBLIC HOSPITALS	PRIVATE HOSPITALS	TOTAL	SIGNIFICANCE TEST		
AE Prevalence	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	χ^2	SIG.	LEVEL
	53 (56.9)	**40** (43)	**93**(100)	2.55	0.11	NS
AE Severity level	N (%)	N (%)	TOTAL	χ^2	SIG.	LEVEL
Low	**21** (22.5)	**7** (7.5)	**28** (30,1)	**7.122**	**0.28**	**NS**
Average	**17** (18.2)	**21** (22.5)	**38** (40,8)			
High	**15** (16.1)	**12** (12.9)	**27** (29)			
Patient Safety Culture Index (scale 24-104)	Value	Value	Value	t	SIG.	LEVEL
	52.67	**52.96**	*	**0.12**	**0.91**	**NS**
Patient Safety Perception Index (scale 12-40)	Value	Value	Value	t	SIG.	LEVEL
	30.3	32.7	*	8.7	0.000	**S**

S= Significant. NS= Not significant. * No value applies.

III.- Regression of variables: Patient Safety Culture and Patient Safety Perception, based on the level of severity and prevalence of adverse events identified.

Figure 1 highlights the correlations identified between the variables. When we evaluate AE prevalence and severity (AEP in Figure 1) in relation to Patient Safety Culture (PSC in Figure 1), we see a strong and negative correlation (rho = -0.8), indicating that the behaviour of one variable is determined by the performance of the other (showing dependence). It can therefore be observed that the higher the prevalence of serious AEs, the lower the culture of the healthcare professionals; similarly, if culture is favourable, AE prevalence and severity are lower.

Figure 1

Proposed theoretical relational model showing the three aspects of patient safety and its results in our study

.



An inverse relationship was found between the patient safety perceived by patients and AE prevalence (rho = -0.06); that is, the higher the patient perception of safety, the lower the occurrence of AEs; and the lower the perception of safety, the higher the occurrence of AEs. It is important to note (Table 3) that severe AEs were the least perceived or detected by the patients (PSPI = 25.4, 33.3%) and the statistically more frequent ones were representatively perceived by the patients (68.4%).

It is estimated that among the population studied at the public hospitals, 19 out of 100 patients admitted are likely to experience an AE, and 7 of these would not detect having suffered any kind of AE. In private hospitals, 14 out of 100 patients admitted may suffer an AE, and 5 of these would not be aware of where the AE originated.

When we relate Patient Safety Culture and Patient Safety Perception, we can see that both variables are independent, with no correlation (rho = 0.0001). Contrary to the previous results, we have observed that the safety perceived by the patients was not related to the safety culture detected among the healthcare professionals as the patients did not detect the low level of culture that was identified among the professionals and it did not determine their outcomes. We therefore need to evaluate the other variables that allow us to define the patient's perception.

Table 3
Distribution of severity level of incidents perceived and not perceived by patients, by hospital.
PuH: Public Hospitals. PrH: Private Hospitals.

Severity of AE	Perceived AE		Not Perceived		Total	
	PuH	PrH	PuH	PrH	PuH	PrH
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Low	**18** (42.5)	**6** (40)	**4**	**5**		
Average	**14** (35)	**12** (80)	**3**	**9**	**26** (68.4)	
High	**8** (20)	**1** (6.6)	**6**	**11**	**9** (33.3)	
Total	**40 (75.4)**	**15 (37.5)**	**13 (24.5)**	**25 (62.5)**	**93 (100)**	

PuH: Public Hospitals. PrH: Private Hospitals.

DISCUSSION

Many researchers have studied the variables examined in this article (AEs (1,3–6,8,12,34); PSC,(13,30) and PSP (33) individually; however, to our knowledge, the integrated study of AE Prevalence, PSC and PSP for the same population, analysed in a common care process for all—in person, time and space—, is an innovative and unprecedented approach and contributes methodological and theoretical value to the field of study.

The integrative study of these variables is based on the theoretical idea that patients(11) and healthcare professionals and their interaction in the process(35) are all interconnected, and that patient safety must be approached from all angles in an integrated manner.(36)

The main results of this study concern the association between the safety culture perceived by healthcare professionals (rho = -0.8), and the degree of safety perceived by patients (rho = -0.06). These two factors have an inverse relationship with AE prevalence and severity at both types of hospital (rho = 0.1). Another important finding is the lack of relationship between the culture of healthcare professionals and patients' perception of their safety, which are not associated; that is, what happens in one has no bearing on the other (rho = 0.00).

Patient safety culture perceived by healthcare professionals associated with AE prevalence, severity and patient perception.

AE prevalence in association with patient safety culture is a field that has received moderate research attention;(36) however, the validity of some methodologies used to evaluate patient safety culture has been questioned.(13)

As expected in the hospitals that presented a low culture index, high AE prevalence and severity were detected, maintaining an inverse relationship, as shown by some other studies(13,37,38) and strengthening the theory that culture is an important criterion for maintaining a sustainable patient safety culture.(9) Nevertheless, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that safety culture directly impacts patient outcomes; that is, that there is a lineal causal link between the two. It can be stated, however, that it is probable that there is a bidirectional relationship between the safety culture of healthcare personnel and patient outcomes.(39)

Conversely, no relationship was observed between the patient safety culture expressed by the professionals and the level of safety perceived by patients; that is, the patients studied constructed their view based on their hospital experience, and possibly on other criteria that may be specific to the characteristics of the population. In this respect, the study done by Schwappah et al (40) shows, that 95% of patients and 78% of healthcare workers agreed that both patient education and the willingness of patients to accept the propositions of healthcare professionals increase patients' perceptions of the care received (OR 1 , 9, CI 1.1 to 3.3, P = 0.034) and the desire of healthcare professionals to improve their attitudes towards patient safety. However, the study does not make a global assessment of the relationship between safety culture and perception.

Patient perception of patient safety associated with AE prevalence and severity.

Results of this study and others autors like, Evans et al,(41) and Guijarro and cols,(42) repoted that the Patient perception of their clinical safety shows us 2 different scenarios: First, centres where a higher AE prevalence was detected had a low perceived patient safety index, which tells us that, in all likelihood, the results of the care process do affect perception of it, in this case, increasing patient distrust as these authors had pointed.(41,42) This could reinforce the reported idea that a more active patient-user role needs to be promoted, which would help identify critical points in the care process, and ensure that appropriate measures are taken,(11) while also being a mitigating factor(43), and even a defence barrier,(44) in the emergence of AEs. It may also contribute to institutional improvement, including the reporting of AEs;(13–15,37) .This idea should be explored further in subsequent studies.

Secondly: The AES variable is also inversely associated with patient perception of their safety; that is, AE severity was the key factor in determining the extent to which respondents felt unsafe, with the most serious AEs generating the most distrust. This variable is therefore a strong predictor of the sense of safety as also point by Sammer CE and cols. (41)

The results also show that a significant percentage of highly serious AEs are not detected by patients (24.5% PuH, 62.5% PrH); this may be because they do not identify the AEs as such or they do not perceive them as errors as others have suggested, rather because they are considered merely part of the hospital experience(45) or perceived as "part of the pathological process".(46). Based on experience in Australia, Evans et al. found that severity is an important predictor of how patients perceive safety; (41) that is, patients' sense of hospital safety and confidence is defined by whether they or any of their relatives have experienced an adverse event when hospitalized ($p<0.001$; CI 95%).

The situations described can respond, according to previous studies, to multiple failures in both institutional and individual care processes,(47) such as a failure to communicate with health professionals,(42) a culture of concealment of errors and/or the specific characteristics of the population (e.g., educational level).(6,11) In this vein, there is an interesting study that concludes that lower levels of education about safety concepts or a lack of clear awareness about unsafe acts(42) are likely to be barriers to patients' involvement. Consequently, these patients do not collaborate or participate in their own individual processes and, as a result, there is a greater risk of an adverse event occurring .(6)(47)

Public and private hospitals and their associations with the culture of healthcare professionals, AE prevalence and patient safety perception.

After analysing prevalence, culture and perception according to hospital type, no significant differences were observed between public and private hospitals; that is, the behaviour of the three variables studied was not differentiated by hospital type. In addition, a systematic review revealed that there is insufficient evidence to show that the private sector hospitals are more efficient or display greater clinical effectiveness than public hospitals(19) in countries with medium and low levels of development. However, specific studies show the opposite, as in the case of Peru,(48) where safety culture is much higher in private than in public hospitals and Pakistan,(49)(50) Nigeria and Malaysia,(51) where private sector hospitals enjoy more acceptance and user satisfaction than public hospitals, albeit only slightly.

We have been unable to locate any research that assesses in a single study the association between patient safety culture, the perception of patient safety and AE prevalence, distinguishing between public and private hospitals. More in-depth research therefore needs to be conducted in countries where prevalence, culture and perception have already been studied in order to minimize bias in national estimates.

LIMITATIONS

This study has some methodological limitations that should be addressed.

The selection of hospitals is not representative of hospitals in Venezuela generally. Due to resource constraints, we were only able to conduct the analysis in a purposely-chosen sample

of four high-level hospitals in one of the most populated regions of the country. The sample size used limits the extent to which our findings can be generalized.

For the initial phases (1 and 2), a resistance to complete the instruments was evidenced, possibly because, as previously indicated, the care providers and patients have little awareness of this matter and/or there is a certain level of fear associated with it due to the threat of punitive measures. In order to avoid lower response rates in these cases the professionals among whom resistance was detected were grouped together and given explanatory sessions about the instrument and its academic and investigative objective to ensure that they completed the questionnaire. This measure may have introduced differences when comparing the results with other similar studies.

CONCLUSIONS

The main findings of this study provide a useful assessment of the simultaneous behaviour of the three factors underpinning patient safety in the research sample. This provides us with a relational theoretical model that can be applied to other populations to allow objective and appropriate decisions to be taken concerning the implementation of plans and strategies on patient safety.

Not all the associations investigated in the sample display a causal link, as established in the literature, and it would therefore be useful to replicate the study and assess the behaviour in other samples.

Lastly, the finding that these variables display similar behaviour at both public and private hospitals invites us to reflect on our assessment of the healthcare system in both sectors, with the aim of providing patients with guaranteed quality and safety.

In short, these results show that although there is sufficient evidence to establish that the variables studied have an impact on the success of initiatives to improve patient safety, greater efforts still need to be made in this area in order to ensure the success of measures to construct a quality patient safety culture, adequate management systems and patient education plans. This consideration should therefore be an active agent in theoretical and practical error management models.(44)

References

1. rennan TA, Leape LL, Laird NM a NM, Ph D, Hebert L, Sc D, et al. Incidence of adverse events and negligence in hospitalized patients. Results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study I. N Engl J Med. 1991;324(6):370–6.

2. Thomas EJ1, Studdert DM, Burstin HR, Orav EJ, Zeena T, Williams EJ, Howard KM, Weiler PC BT. Incidence and types of adverse events and negligent care in Utah and Colorado. Med Care [Internet]. 2000;38(3):261–71. Available from: STOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3767190.

3. Baker GR, Norton PG, Flintoft V, Blais R, Brown A, Cox J, et al. The Canadian Adverse Events

Study: the incidence of adverse events among hospital patients in Canada. CMAJ [Internet]. 2004;170(11):1678–86. Available from: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=408508&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract

4. Zegers M, De Bruijne MC, Wagner C, Hoonhout LHF, Waaijman R, Smits M, et al. Adverse events and potentially preventable deaths in Dutch hospitals: Results of a retrospective patient record review study. Qual Saf Heal Care. 2009;18(4):297–302.

5. Aranaz-Andrés JM, Aibar-Remón C, Vitaller-Murillo J, Ruiz-López P, Limón-Ramírez R, Terol-García E. Incidence of adverse events related to health care in Spain: Results of the Spanish National Study of Adverse Events. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2008;62(12):1022–9.

6. Schiøler T, Lipczak H, Pedersen BL, Mogensen TS, Bech KB, Stockmarr A, et al. [Incidence of adverse events in hospitals. A retrospective study of medical records]. Ugeskr Laeger [Internet]. 2001;163(39):5370–8. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11590953

7. J M Aranaz-Andre´s,1,2 C Aibar-Remo´n,3,4 R Limo´n-Ramı´rez,1,2 A Amarilla,5 F R Restrepo,6 O Urroz,7 O Sarabia,8 L V Garcı´a-Corcuera,9 E Terol-Garcı´a,10 Y Agra-Varela,10 J Gonseth-Garcı´a,11 D W Bates,12,13 I Larizgoitia. Prevalence of adverse events in the hospitals of five Latin American countries: results of the ' Iberoamerican study of adverse events ' (IBEAS). 2011;(May):1043–52.

8. Michel P, Quenon JL, Djihoud A, Tricaud-Vialle S, De Sarasqueta AM. French national survey of inpatient adverse events prospectively assessed with ward staff. Qual Saf Heal Care. 2007;16(5):369–77.

9. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. 30 Safe Practices for Better Health Care: Fact Sheet. AHRQ Publ No 05-P007 [Internet]. 2005;4. Available from: http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/30safe.htm

10. OPS Organización Panamericana de la Salud. Análisis comparado del marco jurídico sobre calidad de la atención y seguridad del paciente (CASP) en América Latina , España y la Comunidad Europea. 2012. 1–126 p.

11. Vincent CA. Patient safety: what about the patient? Qual Saf Heal Care. 2002;

12. Aranaz JM, Aibar C. Estudio IBEAS Prevalencia de efectos adversos en hospitales de Latinoamérica [Internet]. Ocsavinfo. 2010. p. 168. Available from: http://www.seguridaddelpaciente.es/contenidos/castellano/2009/INFORME_IBEAS.pdf?phpMyAdmin=mvRY-xVABNPM34i7Fnm,23Wrlq5

13. Farup PG. Are measurements of patient safety culture and adverse events valid and reliable? Results from a cross sectional study. BMC Health Serv Res. 2015;15(1).

14. Schwappach DLB. "Against the silence": Development and first results of a patient survey to assess experiences of safety-related events in hospital. BMC Health Serv Res. 2008;8.

15. Agoritsas T, Bovier PA, Perneger T V. Patient reports of undesirable events during

hospitalization. Vol. 20, Journal of General Internal Medicine. 2005. p. 922–8.

16. Weingart SN, Pagovich O, Sands DZ, Li JM, Aronson MD, Davis RB, et al. What can hospitalized patients tell us about adverse events? Learning from patient-reported incidents. J Gen Intern Med. 2005;20(9):830–6.

17. Bonvecchio A, Nutr L, Becerril-montekio V, Ec L, Soc M, Carriedo-lutzenkirchen Á, et al. Sistema de salud de Venezuela. 2011;53(1):275–86. Available from: https://www.scielosp.org/article/ssm/content/raw/?resource_ssm_path=/media/assets/spm/v53s2/22.pdf

18. Rosenthal G NW. Public policy and private sector provision of health services. Int J Heal Plann Manag [Internet]. 1996;11:203–16. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1751(199607)11:3%3C203::AID-HPM432%3E3.0.CO;2-0

19. Basu S, Andrews J, Kishore S, Panjabi R, Stuckler D. Comparative performance of private and public healthcare systems in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. PLoS Med. 2012;9(6):19.

20. Gaceta Oficial de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela N° 246.948. Normas sobre clasificación de establecimientos de atención médica del subsector público. 1983.

21. Chirinos M, Orrego C, Montoya C, Suñol R. Prevalencia y Naturaleza de los eventos adversos en hospitales de Venezuela. Invest Clin. 2019;60(4):296–309.

22. González B, Gómez T, Tovar M, Mora L. Parasitosis intestinales en el personal de salud del área de medicina crítica del Hospital Universitario Antonio Patricio de Alcalá, Cumaná, estado Sucre, Venezuela. Rev la Soc Venez Microbiol [Internet]. 2017;37(1):23–9. Available from: http://www.redalyc.org/html/1994/199452813006/index.html

23. Proyecto IDEA. Estudio de la incidencia de efectos adversos en la asistencia hospitalaria. [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2016 Jan 12]. Available from: http://www.proyectoidea.com/sivcea/v3/guia.pdf

24. Proyecto IDEA. Estudio de la incidencia de efectos adversos en la asistencia hospitalaria. [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2013 Jan 12]. Available from: http://www.dsp.umh.es/proyectos/idea/index.html.

25. Proyecto IDEA. Cuestionario Modular (MRF2) para identificación de sucesos adversos por revisión de historias clínicas. [Internet]. 2004. Available from: http://www.who.int/patientsafety/research/ibeas_mrf2_sp.pdf.

26. Chirinos Mónica; Orrego Carola; Montoya Cesar; Suñol Rosa. PREDICTORS OF PATIENT SAFETY CULTURE IN HOSPITALS IN VENEZUELA: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY. Medicine (Baltimore). Accepted (.

27. Blegen MA, Gearhart S, O'Brien R, Sehgal NL, Alldredge BK. AHRQ's Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture. J Patient Saf [Internet]. 2009;5(3):139–44. Available from: http://content.wkhealth.com/linkback/openurl?sid=WKPTLP:landingpage&an=01209203-200909000-00002

28. Blegen MA, Gearhart S, Brien RO, Sehgal NL, Alldredge BK. AHRQ's Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture: Psychometric Analyses. J Patient Saf. 2009;5(3):139–44.

29. Universidad de Murcia. Cuestionario Sobre Seguridad De Los Pacientes. 2005;17. Available from: http://www.msc.es/organizacion/sns/planCalidadSNS/docs/CuestionarioSeguridadPacientes1.pdf

30. MSPS M de S y PS. Análisis de la cultura sobre seguridad del paciente en el ámbito hospitalario del Sistema Nacional de Salud Español. Inf Estud e Investig 2009. 2009;1–131.

31. Levy,Jean-Piere;Varela J. Análisis Multivariante para las ciencias sociales. Prentice Hall España; 2005. 333–334 p.

32. Otros H y. Análisis Multivariante. 5ta ed. Prentice Hall España; 2005. 103–105 p.

33. Ministerio de Sanidad Política Social e Igualdad. Evaluación de la percepción de los pacientes sobre la seguridad de los servicios sanitarios: Diseño y validación preliminar. Inf Estud e Investig. 2009;100.

34. Thomas EJ, Studdert DM, Burstin HR, Orav EJ, Zeena T, Williams EJ, et al. Incidence and types of adverse events and negligent care in Utah and Colorado. Med Care. 2000;38(3):261–71.

35. Sammer CE, Lykens K, Singh KP, Mains DA, Lackan NA. What is patient safety culture? A review of the literature. J Nurs Scholarsh. 2010;42(2):156–65.

36. Mardon RE, Khanna K, Sorra J, Dyer N, Famolaro T. Exploring relationships between Hospital Patient Safety Culture and Adverse Events. J Patient Saf. 2010;6(4):226–32.

37. Assessment R. Promoting a culture of safety as a patient safety strategy: a systematic review. 2016;158:1–4.

38. Wang X, Liu K, You L, Xiang J, Hu H, Zhang L, et al. The relationship between patient safety culture and adverse events: A questionnaire survey. Int J Nurs Stud [Internet]. 2014;51(8):1114–22. Available from: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0020748913003854

39. Innovate I, Encourage D. Does improving safety culture affect patient outcomes? 2011;(November).

40. Schwappach DLB, Frank O, Koppenberg J, Müller B, Wasserfallen JB. Patients' and healthcare workers' perceptions of a patient safety advisory. Int J Qual Heal Care. 2011;23(6):713–20.

41. Evans SM, Berry JG, Smith BJ, Esterman AJ. Consumer perceptions of safety in hospitals. Vol. 6, BMC Public Health. 2006.

42. Guijarro PM, Andrés JMA, Mira JJ, Perdiguero E, Aibar C. Adverse events in hospitals: The patient's point of view. Qual Saf Heal Care. 2010;19(2):144–7.

43. Enero D. Marco Conceptual de la Clasificación Internacional para la Seguridad del Paciente

Informe Técnico Definitivo Enero de 2009. Who [Internet]. 2009;1–160. Available from: http://www.who.int/patientsafety/implementation/icps/icps_full_report_es.pdf

44. JT. R. Reason J. Human error: models and management. Br Med J [Internet]. 2000;320:768–70. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/320/7237/768

45. Mira JJ, Aranaz JM, Vitaller J, Ziadi M, Lorenzo S, Rebasa P, et al. Percepción de seguridad clínica tras el alta hospitalaria. 2008;131(Supl 3):26–32.

46. Blake SC, Kohler S, Rask K, Davis A, Naylor DV. Facilitators and barriers to 10 national quality forum safe practices. Am J Med Qual. 2006;21(5):323–34.

47. Bowling A, Rowe G, Lambert N, Waddington M, Mahtani KR, Kenten C, et al. The measurement of patients ' expectations for health care: a review and psychometric testing of a measure of patients ' expectations. 2012;16(30).

48. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D, Davidoff F, Batalden P, Stevens D, et al. Assessment of patient safety culture in private and public hospitals in Peru. Int J Qual Heal Care [Internet]. 2015;260(1):73. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104-11692015000601041&lng=en&tlng=en

49. Irfan SM, Ijaz a. Comparison of Service Quality Between Private and Public Hospitals: Empirical Evidences From Pakistan. J Qual Technol Manag. 2011;VII(I):1–22.

50. Siddiq A. QUALITY OF HEALTHCARE SERVICES IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOSPITALS OF PESHAWAR , PAKISTAN: A COMPARATIVE STUDY USING SERVQUAL. 2016;06(02):242–55.

51. Ibrahim YS, Mohtar S bin, Dutse AHG. Patient Perception on Service Quality Improvement among Public and Private Healthcare Providers in Nigeria and Malaysia. World J Prev Med Vol 3, 2015, Pages 84-93 [Internet]. 2015 Dec 7 [cited 2018 Jan 29];3(4):84–93. Available from: http://pubs.sciepub.com/jpm/3/4/1/index.html

Ethical considerations

• Validation of each institution by an ethics committee through the evaluation of research protocol. Hospital General del Sur "Dr. Pedro Iturbe"; Hospital Nuestra Señora de Chiquiquira; Hospital Clínico de Maracaibo; Hospital El Rosario, and College of doctors of Zulia State.

• Application of informed consent from patients surveyed.

Contributors

All authors made substantial contributions to the project conception, study design, data analysis and drafting of the paper. All authors have approved this version of the paper for publication.

Copyright for authors

"The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms,

formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) license any third party to do any or all of the above."

Competing interests

None declared.

Ethics approval

Research ethics board.